

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 24, 2006

JK

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor *DWH*

FROM: James D. Smith, Environmental Scientist *JS 04/27/07*

RE: 2006 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/0025

The monitoring plan is described in Section 7.2.5, including Tables 7.1-6, 7.1-7, 7.1-8, 7.1-9, 7.2-4, and 7.2-5 of the MRP.

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?

In-mine

YES ☒ NO ☐

SBC-11 has not been not accessible since early January 2003 because of a roof fall in the Hiawatha workings of Mine #1. SBC-9A replaced SBC-11 for monitoring water in this section of the #1 Mine; however, additional roof falls made Mine #1, including SBC-9A, inaccessible. The pipe that carries the water out of the mine to the culinary water supply is now the location for in-mine water quality and quantity monitoring, and SBC-9A has been retained as the name; it is still considered an in-mine sampling site even though the sample is collected outside the mine.

Springs

YES ☒ NO ☐

Streams

YES ☒ NO ☐

UPDES

YES ☒ NO ☐

"No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the fourth quarter of 2006.

DMR parameters that are not included in the operational parameter lists in the MRP - such as sanitary wastes, visible foam, and floating solids - are not reported in the electronic submittal to the Division. Operational monitoring values are reported for UPDES flow, TDS, TSS, pH, and total iron.

Wells YES ☒ NO ☐

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

In-mine YES ☒ NO ☐

Springs YES ☒ NO ☐

Streams YES ☒ NO ☐

UPDES YES ☒ NO ☐

"No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the 4th quarter of 2006.

Wells YES ☒ NO ☐

Field parameters only were reported for SBC-3; the water level was too low to collect a valid water-quality sample.

3. Were any irregularities found in the data?

Listed parameters were more than two standard deviations from the mean. An asterisk (*) indicates this is not a parameter specifically required by the MRP.

In-mine YES ☐ NO ☒

Springs YES ☒ NO ☐

SBC-4 October: total alkalinity*;
SBC-14 October: flow;
SMH-4 October: flow.

Streams YES ☒ NO ☐

BC-1 October: bicarbonate as CaCO₃;

BC-2 October: bicarbonate as CaCO_3 .

UPDES

YES ☐ NO ☒

"No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the 4th quarter of 2006.

Wells

YES ☒ NO ☐

SBC-3 October: water temperature. Depth was recorded in the field book as 33", but this was revised to 33 ft by Melissa Reynolds.

4. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

Baseline parameters are to be taken in August of year 5 prior to each permit renewal (Table 7-14). Baseline parameters were measured August 2000 and included with the Third Quarter 2000 data submittal. Baseline parameters were to have been determined in August 2005, but they were missed and an NOV was issued. To abate the NOV, the Permittee analyzed for baseline parameters on samples collected in August 2006.

5. Did the Permittee make a timely submittal of all data, including initially missing or irregular data?

YES ☒ NO ☐

6. Does the Permittee need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements?

YES ☐ NO ☒

7. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

None.

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

None.